

WALDO COUNTY COMMISSIONERS COURT SESSION
October 10, 2006

PRESENT: Commissioners John M. Hyk (Chairman), Charles G. Boetsch, and Amy R. Fowler. Also present was Lincolnville Citizen Robert Hammer, Communications Director Owen Smith, Deputy County Clerk Veronica Stover and County Clerk Barbara Arseneau.

J. Hyk convened the meeting at 9:00 a.m.

TREASURER'S REPORT: Present for this report was Treasurer David Parkman and Deputy Treasurer Karen Trussell.

REVENUE:

D. Parkman reported that revenue had already been received at about 105% of the projected amount. About \$2,000.00 came in as a result of D.A.'s court orders, there was miscellaneous revenue in the amount of about \$1,000.00 from Probate restitution and even a small amount in Jail Board, as there had been room to board a few other counties' inmates.

APPROPRIATION REPORT:

J. Hyk informed those present that he had been in contact with an attorney and the Commissioners are not allowed to take money from one department at any point in the year to care for an overdraft in another department. However, the Budget Committee can amend the budget. The Commissioners can let them know what the issues and needs are and they can authorize moving money around from one department to another if they wish. The Commissioners can apply Contingency to overdrafts of an emergency nature, if need be. Other than that, there is no other money that the Commissioners can authorize expending on overdrafts in a department. He felt that it was not prudent to apply Contingency to the board overdraft until the Commissioners were sure there were no other pressing emergencies.

D. Parkman mentioned that the highest Jail board invoice the County had received so far has been around \$50,000.00 to \$60,000.00, so the Commissioners could put \$50,000.00 or so of Contingency funding to apply toward that and leave the rest in case there was another emergency. After that, any invoices might have to be paid out of the 2007 budget.

J. Hyk said the attorney had told him it is permissible to pay the Board bill. That does constitute an emergency. D. Parkman asked if there were any invoices for inmate board in the current warrant being signed today. G. Boetsch said that there was one for \$9,500.00 from Hancock County for the month of August. D. Parkman stated that he would not be writing and requesting the invoices before the end of December as he had done last year. D. Parkman requested that, in December, the Jail Administrator know how many inmates are out at other jails, and how much that bill is going to be, so the Sheriff would know how to budget for this expense for next year. G. Boetsch stated that the Sheriff was already planning for that. J. Hyk confirmed that the 2007 proposal for that line included possible invoices leftover from 2006 boarding.

D. Parkman briefly referenced Probate Court Appointments, as he had been watching that line closely. He praised the Judge for doing much better than last year. There was brief discussion about the Judge wanting to try to stay within the same amount budgeted in 2005. D. Parkman stated that in 2005, that entire department "ended up in the red." J. Hyk said that he did not want to make any more accounting errors in

the future, and not expend money improperly. D. Parkman stated that, if he had been the Judge, he would have wanted to request more for 2006. He recalled her willingness to meet the challenge and keep that line as low as possible. D. Parkman agreed that an excellent job had been done trying to meet this challenge. He thought it should still be brought up to \$10,000.00 or \$12,000.00 in 2007 to be sure to cover it.

A. Fowler noted that the Communications Center budget would be way overdrawn on the Part-time line, but it could not be helped.

RESERVE ACCOUNTS:

D. Parkman read the list of expenditures out of the Reserve accounts.

J. Hyk asked if the new District Courthouse boiler had been completely paid for yet, as well as the other associated costs including the chimney work, flue work, etc. Facilities Manager Keith Overlock was in the next room and was briefly consulted for this information. J. Hyk asked K. Trussell to find out the total cost of this project. K. Overlock entered the room and told the Commissioners that Johnson & Johnson was supposed to come and do the final wiring over the past few days, and it looked as though that had been done, but he planned to speak with Maine Energy to confirm that. J. Hyk asked K. Overlock to provide the total amount spent on this project at the next Commissioners Court Session in November. K. Overlock told the Commissioners that everything had been paid for as far as Maine Energy's work went, but the check for the wiring had been held back. The old boiler has still not been disposed of yet, either.

INTEREST BUDGET – 2000:

D. Parkman informed the Commissioners that \$3,450,000.00 had been borrowed from the \$4,000,000.00 Tax Anticipation Note. The County has already paid back \$1,950,000.00. All that is owed is \$150,000,000. K. Trussell went to the bank last week and learned that the interest amounted to over \$40,000.00. It has not been paid. He brought this up because he had recommended \$40,000.00 last year and the Budget Committee had cut it back. Now it would be overdrawn in that line. He wanted to make sure that more was budgeted for 2007. The 2007 request had started out at \$35,000.00, but after learning this he had asked K. Trussell to change it to \$45,000.00, and now felt it should be \$50,000 because he did not know what the interest rate would be in 2007. The Commissioners agreed to this change. J. Hyk asked how this overdraft was going to be paid in 2006 since this is the only money budgeted in that department. D. Parkman did not know. J. Hyk wondered if this should come before the Budget Committee to be amended, and said he would be in contact with the attorney again to find out. He felt this probably had to be brought before the Budget Committee. D. Parkman asked J. Hyk to find out if this could come from Surplus.

PROPERTY TAX RECEIVED:

D. Parkman reported that, out of 27 municipalities, which included the Unorganized Territory, fifteen had paid their property tax in full. Eleven of those fifteen paid in September.

****G. Boetsch moved, A. Fowler seconded accepting the Treasurer's report. Unanimous.**

TREASURER'S BUDGET – 1025:

Present for this review was Treasurer David Parkman and Deputy Treasurer Karen Trussell. A. Fowler said to let the record show that the Treasurer had requested a pay increase for the Deputy Treasurer, which she added had been brought to the Commissioners' attention by nearly every other department. She asked the Treasurer to explain why. D. Parkman stated that the goal has been "the top of the bottom one-third" as compared to other Maine counties. The Deputy Treasurer's hourly rate presently is below that. He

reminded the Commissioners that the statute provides for the Treasurer to set the rate, with the Commissioners' approval. This is what he had had done. He explained that he came into this job in 2003 and there was a Deputy Treasurer already here. Suddenly, by the fourth month into the year, that Deputy was gone, and Karen came into the position after being the Deputy County Clerk. At the end of that year, she received a "bump" during that year. It has now been three years and he felt that another increase was needed to bring it up to the top of the bottom one-third. In order to do so, the increase as proposed, would bring it to \$17.40 hourly. "We handle between \$6,000,000.00 and \$7,000,000.00 in this department and no other department does that and is responsible for that much money. Karen has had some very good ideas on how to do the job better. The reason at the end of the year that you are getting the Reserve Accounts on the Budget was her idea, not mine." J. Hyk agreed, saying that the first two years he was here, no matter what was asked regarding the finances, if you got an answer at all, it was often wrong. This was no longer the case and this was largely due to Karen. D. Parkman agreed. J. Hyk said he did not have a problem with this, because the goal is the top of the bottom third and he didn't know how else to do it without "being attacked to death." A. Fowler commented that the Commissioners would be attacked anyway and already have been. She had mentioned at the last meeting that it would be nice to bring up the salaries in one or two departments at a time, instead of everyone all at the same time, because it is too expensive. D. Parkman continued that there had not been an increase to keep this position at the top of the bottom one-third for three years. With the responsibilities of this position and what skills have been brought to the position, this increase should occur. The total increase, including the cost-of-living, would be 6.033%. The actual increase above the 3.8% cost-of-living would be about 3%.

When the other two Commissioners were asked for their input, G. Boetsch said he had "drawn his line in the sand during the last meeting." He reminded the group that he had thought they were going to allow 3.8% for everybody and then the Commissioners had increased the Facilities Manager's salary above 3.8%. He felt that the other departments would feel the Commissioners only looked out for those in their own department. This evidently was the case, as had been documented in a recent letter received from some of the other departments since the last meeting. [A letter dated October 5, 2006 had been sent to the Commissioners signed by all the non-exempt full-time employees in the Registry of Probate, District Attorney's Office and Registry of Deeds.] He did not wish to increase the salary for anyone in the County above 3.8%. He commented that everybody does a good job in their positions, not just in the Treasurer's department. He felt every department head could praise their people.

A. Fowler said she had to agree with Greg, especially after the letter recently received, and not that she was putting up with the fact that "a bunch of junior high complaining" was putting an end to this. She told Karen she was sorry that she had to sit there while the Commissioners discussed her salary and told her if she did not want to stay and listen, it was O.K. to leave. A. Fowler agreed that K. Trussell's work was "incredible" and "extraordinary," but did not feel that she should have to take the wrath of the other departments, the way the Commissioners have taken it, because they made an exception to the 3.8% "rule." She reiterated that she wished it could be done one or two departments at a time, but with it was obvious that the group wanted "everything now."

D. Parkman asked how much it would cost for the other departments who had requested reclassifications to achieve that and was told \$7,000.00 and \$15,000.00 in two of the departments. He was asking for \$600.00 more for a raise. It amounted to \$12.45 per week. G. Boetsch argued that if all employees had received the raises according to the Winters' plan, it was over \$100,000.00. He understood that D. Parkman was "going to bat" for his person, but if everyone did that, it would be over \$100,000.00 to \$150,000.00. A. Fowler told

D. Parkman that his Deputy was worth more than what he was asking for, but she was really torn in this situation.

J. Hyk called for a motion.

****A. Fowler moved that the Deputy Treasurer's salary remain at 3.8% for 2007. G. Boetsch seconded this.** J. Hyk called for discussion. He said, first of all, "I think everybody who works in this County is 'our' department. Number two, the standard we always use, which could be wrong, but since Jethro and I came on here, we were always willing to look at each situation so that we could try to get to the top of the bottom third. That's my standard. I don't have a problem adjusting any salary in this County to move toward the top of the bottom third. In the case of the Facilities Manager, it was down near the bottom. That position takes care of all the facilities in this County, where all the other employees work. I don't see him as being 'our' guy. He's everybody's guy. I didn't have a problem moving that position in the direction of the top of the bottom third. The top of the bottom third is not a real 'self-esteem builder' in my mind, but that's where we are. I think we should adjust the Deputy Treasurer's salary up." He asked if there was any more discussion. G. Boetsch referenced the afore-mentioned letter from the other departments. He commented that these people do not look at every employee as being under the Commissioners' umbrella. J. Hyk argued that, just because those people say that doesn't mean that he looked at it that way or that this is the way it is. G. Boetsch continued that this is the opinion of the people in the County. He quoted from the letter as follows: "It is interesting that the Commissioners chose to consider positions that are directly under the supervision of the Commissioners Office."

J. Hyk called this "propaganda." He added that this meant nothing to him and all that the letter told him was that they were at the top of the bottom third. D. Parkman responded that he did not, except to reiterate that \$7,000,000.00 worth is being handled in the Treasurer's Office. Between the Treasurer's and Deputy Treasurer's salary, it was under \$40,000.00. "What CEO in America is going to handle a \$7,000,000.00 at \$40,000.00?" He said he felt so strongly about it that he would offer the 3.8% increase from his "measly" amount that he gets, make his salary remain at last year's rate and give it Karen "so she can pay for the gas to get here." He stated that this was going to be his fall-back position. A. Fowler told D. Parkman that when the question is asked, she wanted him to put it exactly the way he just did. She said he brought up a good point. G. Boetsch argued that the reference to a CEO was the "private world," and these were "two different kettles of fish." A. Fowler said another thing that bothered her was that she hated petty whining and worried about the wrath that Karen would take. K. Trussell said she would forward that to the Commissioners or D. Parkman. D. Parkman said he would take full responsibility for his employee. G. Boetsch stated that this was the same argument that every department had. D. Parkman stated that he had made his arguments and if there was any fallback, they should come to him as the supervisor. If they wanted to go to the Commissioners next, fine.

J. Hyk asked if there was any more discussion. A. Fowler said she respected D. Parkman's honesty and "gall" to speak up. G. Boetsch stated that all the Department Heads had. J. Hyk called for one to speak at a time. A. Fowler said she had yet to see a department head take a decrease in their own salary for one of their employees. "That's dedication. That's someone who knows that she knows what she's doing."

G. Boetsch stated that all the other Department Heads had come to the Commissioners, "but backed off" when the Commissioners said they were only giving 3.8%. A. Fowler remarked that none of them had offered their own 3.8% increase "because they have so much faith in their employees."

G. Boetsch said he was ready for the vote to be called. J. Hyk said he did not want to call the vote if they were not ready. A. Fowler said she was fine. B. Arseneau was asked to read the motion, which was, "A. Fowler moved to keep the Deputy Treasurer at 3.8%," and it was seconded by G. Boetsch. J. Hyk called for the vote.

The vote failed with G. Boetsch in favor and A. Fowler and J. Hyk opposed.

****A. Fowler moved, J. Hyk seconded that the Deputy Treasurer's pay be moved to increase at 6.033%, which includes the cost-of-living increase of 3.8%, as recommended by the Treasurer. No discussion. Passed by two, opposed by G. Boetsch.**

J. Hyk asked if the Commissioners could vote to approve the Treasurer's budget, as it had been reviewed twice now and was settled. They agreed.

****A. Fowler moved seconded to accept the Treasurer's budget for FY 2007, as presented. Hearing no second, J. Hyk asked G. Boetsch if he wished to second it. G. Boetsch responded that he was just trying to "maintain stability." A. Fowler told them she respected and totally appreciated what Greg was saying. J. Hyk seconded. No further discussion. Motion passed by two, with G. Boetsch opposed.**

****A. Fowler moved, G. Boetsch seconded added an extra \$5,000.00 to the Interest (2000) Budget, making the total \$50,000.00. Unanimous.**

COMMUNICATIONS CENTER REPORT:

Present for this discussion was Communications Director Owen Smith and Technology Consultant James Arseneau. J. Hyk asked if he could take a minute to ask J. Arseneau what it would cost to move the Sheriff's Office, the Technology side, roughly. He asked if it would make a difference where it was moved, for example, if it was moved to the District Courthouse, would it cost the same as it would if it was moved to the 100-acre property. A. Fowler commented that there was wiring in the District Courthouse, so it might be hard to compare. J. Arseneau responded that there were many variables. If it was moved to the new property, he would recommend getting the fiber optics in, whereas in the District Courthouse, the County could probably do something different. There is more infrastructure in the District Courthouse than on the new property. Another thing to consider is when the overall building construction is done, it might be cheaper to have that done then than having it done after by another outfit. J. Hyk asked that, no matter where the Sheriff's Office moved, there would be a substantial cost on the Technology side of it. J. Arseneau explained that the Sheriff's Office could be run remotely over some sort of internet connection, but to make it efficient, to have a true connection, they need to be connected by fiber. He reminded the Commissioners that this was a big thing Budget Committee member Bill Sneed did not think was necessary, was to connect the facilities by fiber. J. Arseneau stated that if the Commissioners talked to any other municipality, that is what everybody is doing. In Belfast all the departments are connected by fiber. J. Hyk asked him to start thinking about that for him.

The Commissioners turned their attention to O. Smith. O. Smith told them that Chuck Gerry from the Unity Foundation had planned to be there to speak with the Commissioners about doing some co-location with the county on Aborn Tower. O. Smith wasn't sure why Mr. Gerry wasn't present, but he could give the Commissioners a brief overview. When asked what the cost would be, O. Smith said that they were in the process of ringing the County with wireless Internet capabilities and they have done some testing on Aborn, it has worked well, and they would like to come up with some kind of agreement with the County to be on the tower in exchange for some wireless internet connection for the Sheriff's Department and the remaining

of the County. O. Smith commented that this was a very appropriate time, with the recent installation of the Spillman CAD system. J. Arseneau explained that the County had an agreement with Midcoast Internet Solutions so that if they wanted to put up an antenna, they could. From that agreement the County has had free Internet service for both the two departments in the District Courthouse and the two County departments in the Superior Courthouse. Midcoast paid for all the equipment to put in this connection and the County gets free Internet. The Unity Foundation is looking to do something similar. They would like to use some of the County's existing structures to place these devices up there and in exchange for that, they would provide the County with what it would need to do wireless from vehicles and other types of wireless connections. The Unity Foundation was looking for some sort of working agreement for this trade. If the space is on the tower, this would be of benefit to the County. G. Boetsch asked that until the County was interested in doing this, would the County collect rent. O. Smith said, immediately, the Unity Foundation could provide wireless connection for the Sheriff's Department, which would benefit the patrol so that they could utilize it without having to come all the way back to Belfast. J. Hyk asked if he understood it correctly that Unity Foundation wanted to trade a location for a service. O. Smith said that they were ready to go. J. Arseneau confirmed that the benefits would be immediate. Even if it wasn't turned on for six months, the long-term benefits far outweigh anything. J. Hyk said he didn't know enough about this to know if he should have any concerns. J. Hyk said he didn't think the Commissioners ran Communications matters and suggested that this be brought before the Regional Communications Center Board of Directors. O. Smith told them that the Commissioners own the sites and control the sites and he, as the Communications Director, is the site manager. G. Boetsch said that, as long as the deputies were immediately benefited, he thought it was fine. J. Arseneau asked the Commissioners if they remembered the discussion a while back of possibly getting some space in a room in Unity, this would provide the same service without having to do that. The Foundation had also mentioned that there may be access to one of the buildings up there, too. J. Hyk asked told them to go back and try to solidify the access to the building and then the County would work with them. O. Smith said they have been working closely with this group. They are already operational on Mt. Ephraim, Aborn has been tested and is fine and these were just a few devices that are not very large. J. Arseneau explained that some of the patrol supervisors are utilizing their laptops from their homes if they have DSL connection right now. O. Smith said that if they needed any more from the Commissioners, they would come back before them in November.

O. Smith said he needed to discuss the Zetron radios situation. These are radios, but are actually computers with a special box in them that makes the radios touch-screen radios. Zetron came to the Communications Center in late August recommending a change-out of these systems every three to five years. The Communications Center radios are at the five-year limit. The price would be about \$27,000.00 to do the whole project, which is five radios. O. Smith told them they couldn't afford this and J. Arseneau did some investigation on the "magic box inside," and price-wise, by the time the computers would be bought and the "magic box" was put in, it was a fair amount of money. Zetron came back to O. Smith about six weeks ago with a deal that if the County placed an order with by December 15th, with various discounts and rebates it would be \$10,260.00, including shipping. O. Smith thought that this offer was to get business in 2006, which is a fairly common business strategy. J. Arseneau and he have talked about it and O. Smith thought that this could be purchased if some was squeezed out of the Technology and Communications Center budgets this year, and there might be some needed from the Reserves. This way, it would not have to be added to the 2007 budget. The Commissioners discussed that recently, they had funded one of the Capital Reserves in the amount of \$20,000.00. O. Smith said he did not want to use that, if he could help it. J. Hyk said, technically, that reserve money is for the build-out of a system; it's not to replace radios that everybody knew needed to be replaced after five years, whether they were a computer or a radio. He asked O. Smith if there was ever money and a plan for replacing these radios. O. Smith said he didn't believe it

was ever told to him, or anyone else, that these radios had to be totally replaced every three to five years. But he felt that it needed to be done and he was hoping he would know by November if he had enough to cover this out of the Communications Center budget. O. Smith said he was not coming asking for “a Capital thing for next year.” J. Hyk said he was hearing a request for possible funding from the Technology Reserve. O. Smith said he didn’t know. He was going to try to make it work with the operating budget money for 2006. He wanted to try to make it work that way, but was giving the Commissioners a “head’s up” that he might need some assistance and wanted to make sure they were in favor of this purchase. J. Arseneau reminded the Commissioners that the Communications Reserve they started last year which had recently had funds added to it, is now going to cover this type of thing in the future. G. Boetsch praised the planning involved. The Commissioners recalled that when the Comm Center was built, “there was no planning.” J. Hyk commented that the reduced offer was very good.

G. Boetsch suggested finalizing the Communications Center budget request for 2007.

****G. Boetsch moved, A. Fowler seconded that the Commissioners accept the Communications Center budget (1076) with the changes made during the September meeting.** J. Hyk asked if they could have a minute to review those changes. The change was in 4620, Tower Sites, which increased to \$26,900.00. The personnel section had also been corrected to properly reflect the 2006 budget. G. Boetsch commented that the 2007 budget proposal was only 2.2% increase over 2006. J. Hyk recalled that this was a recently created department that the Waldo County citizens wanted and now, “They’ve got it.” **Unanimous.**

G. Boetsch asked O. Smith how the repeaters in the Lincolnville area were going. O. Smith replied that he didn’t have that site “clinched” yet. He was negotiating with U.S. Cellular, the application was in, and they were reviewing it. G. Boetsch asked if the County would be “wounded” by not having that repeater in this year. O. Smith responded no, because it is grant money.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY REPORT & BUDGET REVIEW - 1010:

Present for this report was EMA Director Dale Rowley. D. Rowley submitted to the Commissioners a flyer the State recently put out with support from the local EMA Directors in a weekend newspaper. J. Hyk asked what has happened to Art Cleaves and was told that he has moved on to be the FEMA 1 Region Director. Charlie Jacobs had been appointed to fill in for Art for the remainder of the year.

D. Rowley reported the following:

1. SEARSPORT GENERATOR HOOK-UP PROJECT: He provided a synopsis, in chronological order, of what has occurred. In summary, Ray Mansfield of Mansfield Electric, was paid \$19,400.00 to install an electrical hook-up at the Searsport Middle School for a future generator and this work has not been done. G. Boetsch said that the Commissioners felt that they should contact an attorney to figure out how to proceed with this. J. Hyk asked if the former EMA Director had done this with LEPC money, not the County’s money. D. Rowley clarified that this was Homeland Security money. J. Hyk thought this seemed like a high number to begin with. D. Rowley said that basically, it was \$7,400.00 for materials and \$12,000 for labor. When he tried to figure out what the project entailed, D. Rowley learned the panel sizes hadn’t even been figured out yet. He had been trying throughout the summer to get this work done. Finally he set an August 31st deadline for the work to be done. The deadline has come and gone. When asked what could happen if this work was not done, D. Rowley explained that the Federal Government could ask for the \$19,400.00 back because it had not been used for what it was granted. When asked if this had to be reported to the Federal Government, not that it should be hidden, but did it have to be reported, D. Rowley replied that he had spoken with Bruce Fitzgerald that the work had not been done and the money had been paid out.

They know about it. G. Boetsch asked how it happened that the money was paid up front in the first place. D. Rowley said that the proposal was made into an invoice, sent it to the State with a request for the money and then the money was sent for payment. When asked if the electrician was still living nearby, it was thought that he was still living nearby but no longer in business. J. Hyk asked D. Rowley to work with B. Arseneau on this by getting in touch with an attorney and find out how to obtain the money and explain that this is Federal Grant money. B. Arseneau wondered if this might be a Risk Pool matter. J. Hyk doubted it, and the Commissioners felt it was best to start with an attorney and go from there. It was emphasized that the County be up front with the Federal Government on what had occurred and to try to take care of it. (J. Hyk briefly provided background on the generator issue to Mr. Hammer.)

The Commissioners said that if the job could not be done, the money had to be recovered.

2. D. Rowley had four Homeland Security Grant applications that required the signature of the Chairman. These were for \$18,000.00 for a Mobile Incident Command and Communications, \$16,000.00 for a generator for Searsport to go with the hook-up as the generator was pulled away from Searsport and sent to Troy Howard Middle School, \$45,000.00 for Law Enforcement Microwave upgrade and \$33,000.00 for the Decon Strike Team Equipment. When asked, D. Rowley said that there is about \$2.5 million in the State for these grants. The Commissioners commended D. Rowley for his initiative in applying for these grant funds.

3. The Pandemic Influenza Tabletop Exercise is scheduled on October 25, 2006 and the Commissioners are invited. The entire exercise, and lunch, are being paid by the Harvard School of Public Health and the Maine Center for Disease Control.

4. The first Annual Local Emergency Management Director's Awards Banquet is being held at the Troy Howard Middle School on November 28, 2006 at 6:00 p.m. D. Rowley provided an agenda. The Commissioners are invited. A. Fowler said she could not attend. A. Fowler commended D. Rowley on what he has accomplished. State Director Charlie Jacobs is coming to present some jackets, Senator Weston is coming to speak and the County Commissioners are invited guests and all local directors and any deputies they may have. B. Arseneau asked G. Boetsch and J. Hyk if they were planning to attend so she could remind them and they responded that they were. G. Boetsch would speak.

****A. Fowler moved, G. Boetsch seconded approving the Emergency Management Agency (1010) budget for 2007 as proposed at \$90,043.00. Unanimous.**

WARRANTS:

G. Boetsch noted that this was a revision to the September 26, 2006 Capital & Restricted Reserve warrant as one invoice was almost paid twice.

****G. Boetsch moved, A. Fowler seconded authorizing payment of the September 26, 2006 revised Capital & Restricted reserve warrant in the amount of \$7,414.62. Unanimous.**

****G. Boetsch moved, A. Fowler seconded authorizing payment of the October 10, 2006 Capital & Restricted Reserve warrant in the amount of \$49,934.28. Unanimous.**

****G. Boetsch moved, A. Fowler seconded authorizing payment of the October 10, 2006 Regular warrant in the amount of \$2,076,776.11. It was noted that the T.A.N. was paid on this warrant. Unanimous.**

TECHNOLOGY BUDGET SECOND REVIEW - 1020-7000:

Present for this review was James Arseneau. J. Arseneau reminded the Commissioners that he was there to provide an update for the Technology Budget.

1. The District Attorney's headsets cost has been researched and J. Arseneau said that the price the District Attorney had budgeted should cover what they were looking for.
2. The University Of Maine Cooperative Extension Office's request for a new phone system had been researched. J. Arseneau requested some quotes and the prices for a couple of the systems ran between \$4,500.00 and \$6,000.00. The University has to come out and do some sort of site survey because they have a system they would prefer to put in and because they are already using the Cisco equipment in the University college system, so it makes sense to stay with that so that their technicians can support that. There was some question about the wiring that needs to be done to each of the office locations, and they were supposed to come out and do a site survey. He had not heard back about this, but if the Commissioners figured up to \$6,000.00, this should cover it. The original request was for \$4,000.00. He recommended \$6,000.00. This had been moved to the Technology budget.
3. J. Arseneau met with Deputy District Attorney Leane Zainea because she had inquired about the \$18,000.00 estimate for the wiring of the Superior Courthouse if the D.A.'s Office moved to one side of the hallway. He went through everything with her. She had her thoughts on what part the State would be caring for, and the Facilities Manager and J. Arseneau had a different impression. They felt that if the County moved the State physically, they would have to do the whole thing. The \$18,000.00 included that. J. Arseneau mentioned that, long-term, if there was any idea that the Commissioners might allow the D.A.'s Office to move, his recommendation would be, if the Superior Court wants to make changes to their office space, the Commissioners might want to wait on doing that. If they change entrances, etc., it may not be what the Commissioners want to have done later. He was bringing that to the Commissioners' attention, in case they were thinking they might allow this change in 2008. G. Boetsch thought that this move was not anticipated. J. Arseneau said that after talking with L. Zainea, he understood where she was coming from. He told the Commissioners that the caveat to all of this is that the State might say, "We'll move, but we won't touch this wall." If that wall isn't touched, the cost would drop because the County would not be re-wiring all the State's wiring that's in there. But until this is verified that the wall would remain, he had to stick with the higher estimate. J. Hyk commented that nobody really belonged in this building. The County is required to provide the State with a Court, and that's it. The County is not required to keep the District Attorney in the Courthouse. They are worried about their security. If they were in a private building, they would not have these concerns. Criminals come into the courthouse – they're coming in for trial. It's a public building. J. Arseneau said that it is also a problem because the witnesses will come in and talk with the District Attorney. The Commissioners indicated that they were not anticipating this type of move within the building, because the building is completely inadequate and there isn't enough room for what everybody wants to do in that building. J. Hyk felt that the D.A.'s Office should at some point be out of the Superior Courthouse. He felt that the space should be used for County records. The Commissioners emphasized that the attorney's office will be staying where they are. J. Arseneau cautioned the Commissioners that if they did decide to move the District Attorney's office to an exterior location, the cost could be even more. Right now there are shared resources in the Superior Courthouse. The Facilities Manager had brought to his attention, however, that some wiring had been done in the Judge's chamber and the people who did this trampled all over everything to get the job done. The telephone wiring consultant that the County has been using, Ray Monreil, is very cognizant of what the County is trying to do in the buildings and is careful to stay within a certain standard and methodology. The State does not try to adhere to that in the Courthouse.

J. Arseneau summarized by saying he had been asked to check on the costs of the headsets and the phone system, and to inform the Commissioners that he had spoken with L. Zainea, "could see both sides" and was just trying to supply the numbers as requested. G. Boetsch asked how much more the 2007 Technology Budget was going to be than the approved amount for 2006 and J. Hyk wondered what the Budget Committee was going to say. J. Arseneau said that because they arbitrarily cut the Technology Budget to \$205,000.00 and unfortunately there was a lot of discussion on the line items. He used the illustration that it would be like the Budget Committee telling the Sheriff which light bars to use on the Sheriff's vehicles. He noted that the amount would be about \$218,800.00, which includes the unanticipated U. of M. telephone system and the additional cameras for the Jail. This amounted to about a 6.3% increase. He had tried to keep it at the \$205,000.00 and these unanticipated costs inflated this bottom line. J. Arseneau feared that they might reduce it. J. Arseneau commented that the Budget Committee has the whole breakdown, so they can pick it apart, such as questioning the type of antivirus the County is using and based on the equipment the County has and the industry does, the County has the best solution, which is also the recommendation of the vendors. The comparison that had been used last year was the school system's usage. This differs from the needs of the County.

****G. Boetsch moved, A. Fowler moved to accept the Technology part of the Commissioners budget (1020) at \$218,000.00. Unanimous.**

J. Hyk asked J. Arseneau to consider the cost of moving the Sheriff's Office as mentioned earlier in the discussion. J. Hyk said what he was thinking was, if space was rented for the Sheriff's Office, some of those technology costs would never be recaptured because eventually they would be moving again. This cost might help to "drive" the County to build on its own property, where the Sheriff's Office would be "forever." J. Arseneau told them the phone system would be movable, and if they moved to one of the existing County buildings, the existing phone service would be able to be added onto.

When asked about the schedule for the Budget Committee meetings, B. Arseneau told the Commissioners that if they finalized the budgets today, the first Budget Committee meeting would be on October 18, 2006 at 6:00 p.m.

FACILITIES BUDGET SECOND REVIEW - 1030:

Present for this discussion was Facilities Manager Keith Overlock. B. Arseneau noted that any changes Keith had made to the budget were in red font.

J. Hyk noted that the Contractual services had been reduced because if the part-time position was approved, the \$4,400.00 in that section could be removed. K. Overlock noted that Capital Outlay increased because an air conditioner was needed for the equipment room, as that is getting very hot and is bad for the equipment. He had received a quote for about \$11,000.00. G. Boetsch noted that with the add-ons, this budget was at about a 4% increase.

There was brief discussion of security doors being provided for the District Attorney's Office in place of relocating them.

****A. Fowler moved, G. Boetsch seconded accepting the Facilities Management budget (1030) with the proposed changes at \$394,374.00. Unanimous.**

K. Overlock said he had spoken with Architect Robert Fenney and hopefully there would soon be some activity on the handicap ramp replacement at the University of Maine Cooperative Extension and the side entrance of the Probate and Commissioners Offices. J. Hyk inquired about the front of the District Courthouse. K. Overlock stated that R. Fenney wasn't going to be able to get to that this year. J. Hyk said this was going to be a problem with the Budget Committee and asked if there was some way possible for this to get done, because it didn't get done last year, either. K. Overlock reported that he has had trouble with the architect all summer. These things have been discussed since January. The Commissioners asked if there was anyone else to do it and K. Overlock replied that an architect has to design this because the slopes have to be a certain standard. When asked if he was having problems with the architect, K. Overlock responded that he hadn't done the drawings yet and, in fact, there weren't going to be any drawings for the U. of M. building. R. Fenney was going out to that building with a contractor and they were just going to do the work. G. Boetsch asked if the District Courthouse front entrance could be done without drawings. J. Hyk said he would be calling R. Fenney to get this done. He told B. Arseneau to remind him to do this. K. Overlock said he had stressed the need for R. Fenney to help with the side entrance and the U. of M. building because those were the most grossly non-compliant.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S BUDGET SECOND REVIEW – 1015:

****G. Boetsch moved, A. Fowler seconded to approve the District Attorneys 2007 budget (1015) as presented, at 1.05% over the 2006 budget. Unanimous.**

COMMISSIONERS BUDGET SECOND REVIEW – 1020:

Present with the Commissioners were County Clerk Barbara Arseneau and Deputy County Clerk Veronica Stover.

A. Fowler asked how the personnel line went down. B. Arseneau explained that the Human Resources/Payroll Director's position was reduced to 3.8% as directed by the Commissioners. The Commissioners wondered why the entire budget had increased by 14% over 2006. B. Arseneau explained that liability insurance had been estimated at 30% above last year, the TABOR referendum costs were new this year. The Jail referendum had been removed. Without TABOR, it probably would have only been about a 10% increase. There was also the increase in Technology and the 3.8% increase for the six employees, including the Commissioners, in this department.

****G. Boetsch moved, A. Fowler seconded accepting the Commissioners budget as presented with the changes.** Discussion: A. Fowler asked about line 5510 and if that was supposed to be reduced. B. Arseneau explained that this had already been reduced from last year's because she will be obtaining the MRSA statutes at no cost online. **Unanimous.**

JAIL BUDGET SECOND REVIEW – 1050:

J. Hyk thought that the increase in the board line from \$400,000.00 to \$700,000.00 might be a little high at this point, but as there was no way of knowing how this could go, he did not want to second-guess this. A. Fowler said that this number could be adjusted by the Budget Committee, if they felt they should.

****A. Fowler moved, G. Boetsch seconded to accept the Jail budget (1050) as presented. Unanimous.**

J. Hyk asked Mr. Hammer if he had any concerns with that budget. R. Hammer mentioned that he was not convinced that the forecast, based upon last year's head count was the number to use to budget with, but it was better than anything he could come up with. Food and transportation and the like were all "givens." The basic thing to do is to change why people are locked up, and he understood the Commissioners had

nothing to do with that. There was brief discussion about the local drug problem, and the general increase in crime, especially around holidays. J. Hyk also mentioned the recent turnover in the last few months. There was a large number, and even the Sheriff had mentioned this was a little more than typical. J. Hyk had heard that even in Brunswick, where the salary and education for law enforcement is among the highest in the state, there were two openings for positions and they only received six applications. People don't really want these jobs anymore for the pay.

REGISTRY OF DEEDS BUDGET SECOND REVIEW – 1065:

****A. Fowler moved, G. Boetsch seconded accepting the revised Registry of Deeds (1065) 2007 budget as presented. Unanimous.**

REGISTRY OF PROBATE BUDGET SECOND REVIEW – 1070:

****A. Fowler moved, G. Boetsch seconded to accept the revised Probate Court (1070) 2007 budget as presented. Unanimous.**

SHERIFF'S BUDGET SECOND REVIEW – 1075:

The CSH line had been reduced at the previous meeting. G. Boetsch commented that this budget was within the L.D. #1 limit.

****G. Boetsch, A. Fowler seconded accepting the Sheriff's (1075) budget for 2007 as revised. Unanimous.**

ADVERTISING AND PROMOTION BUDGET SECOND REVIEW – 1080:

****G. Boetsch moved, A. Fowler seconded accepting Advertising and Promotion (1080) budget as presented, with \$3,500.00 going to WCAP. Unanimous.**

AUDIT BUDGET SECOND REVIEW – 1090:

****G. Boetsch moved, A. Fowler seconded accepting the Audit (1090) budget at \$5,500.00. Unanimous.**

DEBT SERVICE SECOND REVIEW – 1095:

****A. Fowler moved, G. Boetsch seconded the Debt Service (1095) budget as presented. Unanimous.**

UNIVERSITY OF ME COOPERATIVE EXTENSION BUDGET SECOND REVIEW – 2005:

****A. Fowler moved, G. Boetsch seconded accepting the University of ME budget (2005) as revised at \$50,525.00. Unanimous.**

EMPLOYEE BENEFITS BUDGET SECOND REVIEW – 2025:

J. Hyk asked B. Arseneau if there was anything definite for Health Insurance figures. B. Arseneau explained that she had been told to estimate a high figure of 20% plus factoring two new employees. Every year the figures are not firm until sometime in November or December, so it often gets changed right before the Public Hearing.

****A. Fowler moved, G. Boetsch seconded the Employee Benefits budget (2025) as proposed. Unanimous.**

WALDO COUNTY SOIL AND WATER BUDGET SECOND REVIEW – 2035:

****A. Fowler moved, G. Boetsch seconded the Waldo County Soil and Water budget (2035) as proposed. Unanimous.**

RECORDS PRESERVATION BUDGET SECOND REVIEW – 2040:

J. Hyk asked if anyone had been in touch with Cheryl Coats, the former Archivist. B. Arseneau said this stayed the same because it was bare-bones as it was.

****G. Boetsch moved, A. Fowler seconded Records Preservation (2040) budget as presented. Unanimous.**

GRANT WRITING BUDGET SECOND REVIEW – 2050:

The Commissioners had asked for grant writing to be reduced. B. Arseneau spoke with C. Coats and she sent a reduced budget with explanation. The research hours were reduced to three per week, the writing hours from 60 to 48 and this basically makes the budget half of what it was for 2006. C. Coats did mention that she does not get a lot of cooperation from the Departments letting her know what their goals are, their training, etc., so she doesn't know how to research for them. There is a lot of money out there for training and it's too bad the County is not taking advantage of that.

****A. Fowler moved, G. Boetsch seconded accepting the reduced Grant Writing (2050) budget.**

Discussion: A. Fowler remarked that this had been significantly cut and she could only hope that the County could utilize her services for whatever grants might be available. J. Hyk asked B. Arseneau to communicate to the Department Heads that DRG Specialty Services is still actively pursuing grants and needs to know their needs. J. Hyk wondered if the reason the Department Heads were not taking advantage of training is because the County is set up in such a way that it discourages it. If there is a lot of training available for free, yet nobody is taking it, we should ask the question why. **Unanimous.**

G. Boetsch thought that the 2007 budget now was going to be about 10% over 2006. G. Boetsch asked if the L.D. #1 figures had been requested from the Towns and B. Arseneau informed him that this had been done in July. He asked if any of that was being sent back to the County and she told him yes. G. Boetsch hoped that the County would know what the L.D. #1 percentage would be. B. Arseneau said she hoped so, as well. If a few stragglers were not in, they may not have the whole picture. When asked about the State's figure and B. Arseneau stated that this was already available at 2.47%. It had gone down from last year's, which was 2.62%. G. Boetsch predicted that the cap might be around 5.7%. He expressed concern that the County's 2007 budget was close to 10% over last year's. J. Hyk commented, "Well, when you have prisoners coming out your ears and the State doesn't do anything to help you, where do you think you're going to end up?" There was brief discussion about State mandates and lack of funding, while the State does not always adhere to its limitations. There was discussion about Jail costs and Technology costs and that Jail costs are "disturbing" and Technology costs are "just the cost of doing business, and the money has been very well spent."

RESERVE ACCOUNTS:

J. Hyk thought that, because of good management, the reserves are in fairly good shape. He did not know what needed to be added to the Technology Reserve. B. Arseneau said it was \$90,000.00. J. Arseneau had talked with the Commissioners about this before. \$30,000.00 of that \$90,000.00 was earmarked for the Probate Docket System for the second year. J. Hyk said he needed the Reserve targets from Karen. K. Trussell was sent for and she located the sheet with the target amounts and the suggestions. J. Hyk said he had talked with Jethro the other day, who suggested that because of inflation, those targets should go up. The other Commissioners thought this was a good suggestion. J. Hyk asked what should be suggested to the Budget Committee as a figure to be put aside for the future Jail and Sheriff's Department. Inflation on \$18 million was quite a bit. G. Boetsch thought that when people ever want the Jail, we might as well go out to bond for the whole thing. If they set aside money every year, it would take forever to get it. J. Hyk reminded him that he had voted to set up the account and he voted to put money in it in advance. G.

Boetsch thought small amounts, not large amounts. J. Hyk asked why not let the Budget Committee make that decision. G. Boetsch responded that if the Commissioners came out with a huge amount over last year, the Committee would be upset. J. Hyk argued that it was irresponsible. Back when the Communications Center was built, there was a “hue and cry from everybody, ‘Why are we buying the full amount? Why aren’t we putting money aside for a need we know we have?’” G. Boetsch felt that if a large amount was set aside for the Sheriff and Jail reserve, there wouldn’t be enough for the other reserves. J. Hyk felt there wasn’t much needed in the other reserves. G. Boetsch conceded that this was a good argument. A. Fowler agreed that putting aside money for this much-needed Jail was a good idea.

J. Hyk suggested going through the list of Reserves. Each one was reviewed. The end result was that the Commissioners agreed to add \$90,000.00 to Technology, \$3,000.00 to Vehicles, and \$200,000.00 to Future Land and Buildings. Other reserves had already been built up during 2006.

****G. Boetsch moved, A. Fowler seconded recommending funding the Reserves in the total amount of \$293,000.00 for reserves as mentioned above. Unanimous.**

G. Boetsch inquired about the footnote for Technology. Nobody could remember the history behind that wording and asked B. Arseneau to look into the reason it was put in there and when.

R. Hammer departed at this point.

CORRESPONDENCE:

Present for this report was County Clerk Barbara Arseneau, and also Deputy Register of Probate Sharon Peavey, Register of Probate Joanne Crowley, Register of Deeds Deloris Page, Deputy Register of Deeds Stacy Grant, Deputy District Attorney Leane Zainea, Victim/Witness Advocate Deborah McAllian, Clerical Aide Karen Knox, and Legal Secretary Carla Rogerson. B. Arseneau asked the Commissioners if they would like to start with the letter that had been received from the employees in these departments, as she believed that this was why they were present. J. Hyk asked if those present wished to discuss this letter and told them to go ahead.

S. Peavey asked if there had been a decision made to reclassify those ten positions. J. Hyk said he had not taken it up because they had just finished up the budget work. S. Peavey asked if Correspondence had been read yet. J. Hyk said they were just starting it now. L. Zainea asked if the budgets had already been voted on. The Commissioners replied that they had. C. Rogerson said she had called and was told that Correspondence was before the budget. She thought she had spoken with someone in the office there. B. Arseneau asked if the D.A.’s Office had received the agenda by Email and was told that they had. L. Zainea said they had but when Carla called to find out whether or not the budget would be voted on before or after Correspondence, she was told after Correspondence. B. Arseneau said she had said they would be reviewing the budgets and she would not have known when the Commissioners would actually vote on it, but said that the agenda had been sent out and they should have received it. Carla said she thought Sharon had called about it, too. B. Arseneau said that this wasn’t to mislead anyone and that she could not predict when things will be voted on or done. L. Zainea stated that no-one was suggesting that.

G. Boetsch told them to present their case. L. Zainea asked if the Commissioners had read the letter that had been sent to them. She said that, as they would recall, they were told when they met with the County Commissioners that there would be a 3.8% cost of living increase across the board and it had now been reported that there were certain employees who would be getting more than the 3.8% increase. G. Boetsch told them that he understood from their letter that all the Commissioners were being lumped together and

stated that he had stood his ground, even again today, at 3.8%, so it was not a unanimous decision. L. Zainea said she understood this. G. Boetsch said that he was really upset by the letter. L. Zainea stated, nonetheless, it had been voted on by the Commissioners to give certain employees beyond the 3.8% cost of living increase. J. Hyk responded that this was correct and it was well within their right to do that and explained that this was done because the goal had been since he and former Commissioner Pease had taken office as Commissioners that they were going to try to get everyone in the County to the top of the bottom third. That was the yardstick, as compared with certain other counties by valuation, etc. That is where everyone is or they are working their way toward that. One employee was at the bottom and was the lowest paid Facilities Manager in the State and was still not at the top of the bottom third, and this was moved that halfway in one year.

A. Fowler mentioned that the Facilities Manager also where the Commissioners saved \$18,000.00 when the Commissioners made that first initial decision on it. \$11,800.00 was saved between the courthouses right there, \$10,000.00 in Superior Court, \$5,000.00 in the Communications Center. D. McAllian asked how he could have saved money in the budget when it had been approved for another part-time employee at \$12,000.00. A. Fowler said that this was it worked. She said perhaps she shouldn't have used the word "saved," but rather that it "balanced out" or evened out. B. Arseneau suggested that A. Fowler may have been thinking of the line for Janitorial fill in during the Facilities Manager's absence. That line was reduced. A. Fowler said that was so, but there was also another \$10,000.00. L. Zainea said that what was problematic was when each of the department heads appeared before the Commissioners, it was reaffirmed to them that everyone was getting just the 3.8% across the board, when in essence it had already been decided to give the increase. A. Fowler thought this was done after meeting with the other departments. L. Zainea argued that she had appeared at 2:40 in the afternoon and specifically asked if everyone had received the 3.8% and she had then asked if that meant that there was not going to be any reclassification of individuals and the Commissioners confirmed that was correct and stated that they were "not going to be tinkering with the budget like they had in the past." J. Hyk said that they had changed their minds. L. Zainea said she understood that this was the prerogative of the County Commissioners, but referring to the letter, she thought that they were further creating inequities within county positions primarily within support staff who have not been reclassified in the twelve years that she had been here, unless it was individual cases. G. Boetsch restated that he had not been in favor of this and had voted against this. She stated she understood that, but this vote had left "a very sour feeling."

A. Fowler said she had said she agreed and had said the same thing this morning. She added, however, ideally, she wished that this could have been done one department at a time, but the Commissioners could not please all the people all the time. She did not have "a grand solution."

J. Hyk commented that the solution is to try to do the total reclassification, but the last meeting he was at in which it was going to be 4 years of 4.8% or whatever, after everyone started looking at that classification much harder, it was very apparent that some people were going to get way more money than they should and others were not going to get the money they should, so that was a "flawed" piece of work. He realized that everyone had worked very hard on this and was glad they did, he thought that this was what they had to do, but it didn't happen this year.

L. Zainea disagreed that this was a flawed piece of work and the reason she said this was that there were certain departments and certain individuals who have been increased over a period of time beyond the cost of living increases and that is why some people were going to be making much more than their counterparts whereas other departments were not. This was what they were trying to address when than those

department heads came and asked for positions to be reclassified within the current classification scale. For example, the Facilities Manager – the Commissioners have now created a new classification scale by giving a 6.5% increase to this position. She asked where that was going to now fit into that scale and that the Commissioners were going to have to create a new line. A. Fowler asked what that line was before. J. Hyk said a new line might have to be made. L. Zainea claimed that this was creating a greater disparity among the other employees. The Facilities Manager position was at class VI. Last year when the exempt were taken out, they had to put that position in because he had received a blanket salary of \$31,000.00 and it couldn't fit into the current classification scale so it was recreated as far as the pay scale goes. Class VI was recategorized as far as pay scale goes so that they could fit that position in. By giving that position a new increase of \$2,000.00 on top of the \$31,000.00, making it \$33,000.00, the Commissioners were now creating a new class because it was not going to fit into the current classification scale. A Class VII had to be created this year, which the County had never had no one had filled.

A. Fowler asked if all the departments worked 35 hours per week. She was told that the District Attorney's office works 40 hours and B. Arseneau stated that the Facilities Manager works 40 as well. Someone asked if the Sheriff's Administrative Assistants worked 40 hours and someone else thought, no, they worked 35 hours. B. Arseneau thought that this had changed, but said that someone would have to talk with that department.

Karen Knox stated that it was very discouraging to be told that they were being underpaid and nothing was offered to them, but everybody gets the same increase so the people who are already being overpaid are getting even more overpaid, and they were still waiting.

Stacy Grant stated that back in 2003 their office wrote a letter to the Commissioners requesting that all the categories get brought up to be more equivalent with Category VI that was created that year and she wished she had a copy of that letter, but she didn't. They had received a letter back from the Commissioners stating that what they needed to do was to reclassify the positions to get them brought up and Deloris was going to do that but was told that they had to wait until the Winters thing went through. And then when they tried to do it after that, and this was three years ago. J. Hyk said he was certainly willing to work toward getting this done, he knew that they were unhappy, and it was his idea to get Winters in here. He thought they were on the right track, but he knew they were not happy and he could not make them happy this year, so that is where they were with this. He stated that he was not changing his mind. If they could change A. Fowler's mind, then maybe they would be somewhere else, but he was not changing his mind.

A. Fowler said she had not been present at the meeting when some of these things had been spoken about, so she had asked for all the surveys that she had been given, based on all the other area counties and that is how the top of the bottom one third worked. L. Zainea said that this was based on all the sixteen counties and where Waldo County fit was based upon a survey that was done several years ago and she was not sure that Waldo County actually fits within the top of the bottom one-third anymore. A. Fowler agreed that some of the positions, it was way up and some were way down. This was why she asked who worked 35 or 40 hours because that was a "biggie" that she had noticed. A lot of the other counties were 40 hours per week. She had looked at one particular position and many of the other counties were at 40, whereas Waldo County was at 35.

D. McAllian said that, even going through that whole Winters' thing, that was tabled and withdrawn and then everybody went back to work and found the most disparity was in the ten positions that are talked about in that letter. She didn't understand why that was not being considered this year when there were

several other county employees that have been increased in hourly pay. A. Fowler asked how much the increase was in the D.A.'s office and was told by L. Zainea that it was \$10,000.00. She asked if there was something in the D. A.'s office that could be shown, like the Facilities Manager had done, where something else could be gotten rid of and the personnel line increased. L. Zainea said she had done that. She had eliminated certain costs to lower the overall cost, and thought that Deloris had done the same thing. J. Crowley said she had done the same thing, but it was not a great deal, because her budget was close anyway. D. Page said her increase with the classification was about \$7,000.00. This year she was going to put in for a copier machine at \$7,500.00. If she had put that in, she doubted that the Commissioners would have said anything. She was trying to get the "girl's their reclassification," so she took out her \$7,500.00 copier machine so she could pay for that. The increase isn't that much for her office. She wanted to do this for her people.

L. Zainea said to her, having sat through what she sat through what they went through last year when they were addressing the budget and being asked, "What do you want, what do you want? Let's do this," and people throwing out figures, she was hoping this could be avoided this year by addressing particular issues and getting the classifications more in line with other positions countywide. She said that she was speaking for both Joanne and Deloris because they had seen increases outside of support staff and support staff seems to be one area where there hasn't been growth except for cost of living increases and that was because they have to work within the current classification scale that the County has. That's what they were trying to do this year by reclassifying certain positions within the same scale.

J. Hyk said he understood what they were saying, but he could not take that to the Budget Committee. He would take the letter to the Budget Committee and would share it with them and tell them that this is what they would be presenting to them next year, but he would not do that this year. He apologized and stated that this was how he had voted. D. McAllian asked why he couldn't take it to them, because she didn't understand why he couldn't even present it to them. J. Hyk said he was not willing to put it in the budget. The Commissioners create the budget and take it to the Budget Committee and he was not willing to put it in the budget.

A. Fowler said the reason she was in favor of the Facilities Manager position, was because he had shown her in the original budget where he was making the cuts. She was not aware of that in anyone else's budget. D. Page had said she had not even put the copier in. A. Fowler wished she had, because then she could have seen that. D. Page said she wished she had, too, but she was trying to give the Commissioners a good budget. A. Fowler continued with the Deputy Treasurer's position, and stated that the Treasurer had stated he would be willing to give up his 3.8% increase and give it to that position. She had not known of any other bosses that would say that to their employee. D. Page said that the other departments had given up things in their budgets, too; maybe not salaries. A. Fowler said the Treasurer was willing to give up his salary increase. L. Zainea said that the reason they had not told the Commissioners where they had made cuts was because when they first appeared to present their budgets, they were told that the increase, across the board was going to be 3.8%, so they didn't argue. A. Fowler said she appreciated that. She told B. Arseneau to make a note that she was willing to either rescind her motion or revisit the Treasurer's Department and Facilities Manager. G. Boetsch said that this would be in line with his view. A. Fowler said she would stay with the 3.8% and stay with that. She was willing to argue and look into that and she wished this wasn't like a bunch of school kids where she could say, that this year one department would be done and then another one the next and everyone would be happy, but it isn't. "It's all or nothing."

J. Crowley asked if it was too late to ask the Commissioners to revisit their budget, because they had already voted on that. She asked if this could be reconsidered and that everybody would be put at 3.8%. G. Boetsch said that they would all be in total agreement because he was concerned that he had been “thrown in that same kettle of fish with the one that crossed the line, because in the letter they said, ‘the Commissioners.’” A. Fowler chided G. Boetsch, saying that there were only twelve votes for him in that room. She started to state that the group had a legitimate point when G. Boetsch interrupted her and told her that she was not being fair to say that, that the Commissioners told them they were going to give a 3.8% across the board and the other two Commissioners had changed their minds, he hadn’t. He told her he was offended by her saying that. J. Hyk pounded the gavel and stated that only one person would be speaking a time, starting now, when he recognized them. He asked who wanted to go first. G. Boetsch stated firmly, “I’m offended.” To A. Fowler, he said, “It’s not correct for you to say that.” J. Hyk asked who wanted to speak next. A. Fowler said she was all set, that they needed to discuss those two departments. J. Hyk asked if they were going to vote on that, and she replied that this was correct. J. Hyk said he assumed someone was going to make a motion to reconsider the entire budget. A. Fowler agreed that the entire budget had to be reopened.

****A. Fowler moved to reopen the budget for FY 2007. J. Hyk called on G. Boetsch. G. Boetsch seconded the motion. Unanimous.**

****A. Fowler moved to revisit 1025, Treasurer’s Department and 1030 Facilities Management and recommended that they leave the employees in those departments at a 3.8% cost of living increase. G. Boetsch seconded that. Passed by two, with J. Hyk opposed.**

The employees that had come in for this discussion thanked the Commissioners.

CORRESPONDENCE, CONTINUED:

Present for this report was County Clerk Barbara Arseneau and Deputy County Clerk Veronica Stover.

J. Hyk asked if there was any more correspondence. G. Boetsch interrupted and told the Chairman that he wanted to take a break, which J. Hyk agreed to. After the break, Commissioner Boetsch announced that he was leaving the meeting and going home. J. Hyk asked if he might speak with him for a moment privately, which they did. Both Commissioners returned to the room and Commissioner Fowler apologized to Commissioners Boetsch for what she had said earlier. She then stated that she would be leaving for the day. J. Hyk spoke outside with her briefly and then returned to the meeting.

J. Hyk told B. Arseneau to consider the letter from the three departments as the first piece of correspondence and to write a brief letter to all the departments who had come in confirming that all the departments were only getting 3.8% salary increases.

B. Arseneau then reported the following:

2. Architect Curtiss Pulitzer called last Friday to inquire where the County stood on planning for the referendum. She did not know what to tell him, but apparently there was little miscommunication between SMRT and R. Fenney as to when to meet, but they would be working that out among themselves. C. Pulitzer invited the Commissioners to the Lincoln County Jail open house on October 27, 2006 at 10:00 a.m. J. Hyk remarked that he would rather be attending the open house of the Waldo County Jail. He asked for an R.S.V.P. if they were going. None could attend.

3. A request for a tax abatement hearing was sent by fax over the weekend from Philip and Lisa Yates for property owned by them on Stevens Shore Rd. in Palermo. As far she knew, they had met all the date requirements. She asked if the Commissioners wanted to review this to see if they wanted to hold a hearing. J. Hyk said he thought they had to hold a hearing, unless proven otherwise.
4. Eastern Maine Eastern Development Corporation Board of Directors requested the Commissioners to vote on the ballot for someone to serve for the next three years on that Board. Terry St. Peter had been nominated, or the Commissioners could write in a candidate. J. Hyk told G. Boetsch to vote on this as he saw fit.
5. A letter had been sent as a response to the County's application for the Jail variance, which was approved for one more year. Director Ralph Nichols expressed that this was the last time this variance would be approved unless a long-term solution was being planned to meet the conditions of the variance. While progress had been made to the short-term issues, the long-term issues had to be met. The Commissioners discussed the impact that this will have on the County. J. Hyk told B. Arseneau that a letter needed to be written and a copy of this letter be sent to the Budget Committee and the Towns. G. Boetsch commented that this was a "good push toward a new Jail." J. Hyk said he would work with B. Arseneau to put a letter out to the Towns, Budget Committee and former Jail Research Committee. The original Jail inmate population is 19 maximum. The current variance allows for 32 inmates. The Commissioners said they need to discuss this matter with the Sheriff as soon as possible.
6. Corrections Officer Joshua Bowles has received certification from the Maine Criminal Justice Committee and will receive a pay step increase from \$13.26 to \$13.59 per hour, effective September 22, 2006. This was noted by the Commissioners.
7. MCCA Director Robert Howe has sent an inquiry wondering if legislation would need to be changed giving Counties authority to conduct a referendum, if TABOR passes. The Commissioners suspected that legislation probably would have to be changed, but the Waldo County Commissioners were responding that they did not know.
8. The Commissioners had asked B. Arseneau to find out if the Christmas tree lights on the tree at Superior Courthouse had been wired to City Hall and the answer is yes.
9. A. Fowler had asked B. Arseneau to obtain the statistics and information regarding the Kennebec County inmate garden project. She had mailed that information to the Commissioners last week. It turns out it is not a "money-maker" in the sense that they do not sell surplus harvest, as the local farmers would protest. It does save Kennebec County money because the produce is used in the Jail, it gets the inmates out of the Jail sooner, they are out during the day doing meaningful work and behave better at the Jail because they are sufficiently tired.
10. J. Hyk was invited to the E.M.D.C. annual Corporators meeting on October 24, 2006 and he told her he would not be attending.
11. The first Budget Committee meeting will be October 18, 2006 at 6:00 p.m.

12. B. Arseneau asked if the Commissioners had made a decision in response to the request from Chief Deputy Robert Keating for an increase in the Deferred Comp Match. The Commissioners were not going to change the match at this time, and J. Hyk said he had already called the Sheriff telling him so.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS:

J. Hyk wanted to send a letter to Knox and Penobscot counties, exactly like the one from two years ago, asking if they wished to do any joint planning. B. Arseneau said there had been a figure on that and asked if should be included in this letter. G. Boetsch wanted to just be vague and see if they were interested. J. Hyk disagreed, stating that the study would cost money. B. Arseneau also asked if this was going to be done now or in 2007. J. Hyk said to send the same letter, with the same figures.

J. Hyk also wanted to discuss the matter of Endangered Species resolve that was generated from Franklin County. The government wants to do away with this and make the States and Counties deal with it. J. Hyk wanted it to remain the same as it has been. The Commissioners instructed B. Arseneau to create a resolution just like Franklin County's from Waldo County and to send it back to Commissioner McCrane in Franklin County.

****G. Boetsch moved, J. Hyk seconded supporting this resolve. Passed by two.**

NEXT MEETING:

The next Commissioners Court Session will be November 14, 2006.

****G. Boetsch moved, A. Fowler seconded adjourning the meeting at 1:30 p.m. Unanimous.**

Respectfully submitted by *Barbara L. Arseneau*
Waldo County Clerk